

1 Michael C. Kelley (SBN 090062)  
mkelley@sidley.com  
2 Bradley H. Ellis (SBN 110467)  
bellis@sidley.com  
3 Jose F. Sanchez (SBN 161362)  
jose.sanchez@sidley.com  
4 Jodi E. Lopez (SBN 231117)  
jlopez@sidley.com  
5 SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP  
6 555 West Fifth Street, 40th Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90013  
Telephone: (213) 896-6000  
7 Facsimile: (213) 896-6600

8 Michael L. Rugen (SBN 85578)  
mrugen@sidley.com  
9 Robert B. Martin III (SBN 235489)  
rbmartin@sidley.com  
10 SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP  
555 California Street, Suite 2000  
11 San Francisco, California 94104  
Telephone: (415) 772-1200  
12 Facsimile: (415) 772-7400

13 | Attorneys For Defendant KPMG LLP

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

## IN RE NEW CENTURY

) Consolid. Case No. 2:07-cv-00931-DDP  
(FMOx)  
) Assigned to: Hon. Dean D. Pregerson  
)  
**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING  
KPMG LLP'S MOTION FOR  
SUMMARY JUDGMENT**  
)  
) [Filed concurrently with Notice Of  
Motion And Motion For Summary  
Judgment Or, In The Alternative,  
Summary Adjudication; Memorandum Of  
Points And Authorities; Declaration Of  
Allan W. Kleidon; [Proposed] Statement  
Of Uncontroverted Facts And  
Conclusions Of Law; Declaration of Jodi  
E. Lopez; [Proposed] Judgment]  
)  
)  
)

## [PROPOSED] ORDER

1                   The Motion for Summary Judgment of defendant KPMG LLP  
 2 (“KPMG”) came on regularly for hearing before this Court on March 29, 2010. After  
 3 full consideration of the evidence, all declarations and papers filed in connection with  
 4 the motion, the authorities submitted by counsel, and oral argument, the Court finds  
 5 that there is no triable issue of material fact and concludes that KPMG is entitled to  
 6 judgment as a matter of law.

7                   Plaintiffs, who purchased New Century Financial Corporation (“New  
 8 Century” or the “Company”) stock, allege that KPMG committed securities fraud by  
 9 making material misrepresentations in its 2005 audit report of New Century. They  
 10 seek to hold KPMG liable for allegedly violating Section 11 of the Securities Act of  
 11 1933, 15 U.S.C. § 77k and Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, 15  
 12 U.S.C. § 78j(b).

13                  Plaintiffs’ New Century stock lost 97% of its value following a series of  
 14 disclosures by New Century between February 7 and March 13, 2007. Those  
 15 disclosures stated, among other things, that the Company was experiencing lower  
 16 profits in its 2006 and 2007 operations, that it had discovered accounting errors made  
 17 by Company personnel during 2006, that it had decided to restate its unaudited  
 18 financial statements for the first three quarters of 2006, that it expected to realize a  
 19 loss for the entire 2006 year, and that it would be unable to file its 2006 Form 10-K  
 20 with the Securities & Exchange Commission. Plaintiffs seek to recover from KPMG  
 21 the investment losses they suffered when New Century’s stock price dropped  
 22 following these disclosures.

23                  In order to prevail on their claims, plaintiffs must prove “loss causation,”  
 24 *i.e.*, that the decline in the value of their stock in New Century occurred in reaction to  
 25 the market’s learning about the alleged misstatements in KPMG’s 2005 audit report.  
 26 *See Dura Pharm., Inc. v. Broudo*, 544 U.S. 336, 342 (2005) (loss causation is the  
 27 “causal connection between the [defendant’s] material misrepresentation and the

1 [plaintiff's] loss"); *In re WorldCom, Inc. Sec. Litig.*, 2005 WL 375314, at \*6  
 2 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 17, 2005) ("the negative causation defense in Section 11 and the loss  
 3 causation element in Section 10(b) are mirror images").

4 Plaintiffs have not adduced sufficient evidence from which a reasonable  
 5 trier of fact could conclude that KPMG's alleged misstatements caused their losses.  
 6 The evidence demonstrates that the market did not interpret any language in New  
 7 Century's disclosures between February 7 and March 13, 2007 as revealing that the  
 8 2005 audit report or the 2005 financials were misstated, and that the market instead  
 9 continued to view the 2005 financials as reliable until May 24, 2007, when the  
 10 Company disclosed that the 2005 financials should no longer be relied upon. In short,  
 11 KPMG is entitled to summary judgment because no reasonable trier of fact could  
 12 conclude that the market understood any of the disclosures in question to reveal the  
 13 purported truth about KPMG's 2005 audit report. *See In re Retek, Inc. Sec. Litig.*,  
 14 621 F. Supp. 2d 690, 703 (D. Minn. 2009) ("without producing specific evidence  
 15 demonstrating that the public became aware of an alleged misrepresentation through a  
 16 corrective disclosure . . . a plaintiff cannot satisfy [his] evidentiary burden at summary  
 17 judgment").

18 Furthermore, KPMG also is entitled to summary judgment for the  
 19 independent reason that the evidence demonstrates that no portion of the stock price  
 20 declines following New Century's adverse disclosures was caused by any alleged  
 21 misstatements in KPMG's 2005 audit report. "Even assuming Plaintiffs could  
 22 establish that [the disclosures in question] were corrective disclosures, Plaintiffs  
 23 nevertheless cannot demonstrate that the market reacted negatively to the disclosures,  
 24 rather than to other information simultaneously released to the market." *In re*  
 25 *Omnicom Group, Inc. Sec. Litig.*, 541 F. Supp. 2d 546, 553 (S.D.N.Y. 2008). Even if  
 26 the evidence could support a finding that the market learned during the class period  
 27 about KPMG's alleged misstatements, Plaintiffs would still be required to

1 disaggregate the portion of their losses caused by the market learning about KPMG's  
2 alleged misstatements from those losses caused by the market learning about New  
3 Century's alleged misstatements or other negative news generally. *See e.g., McAdams*  
4 *v. McCord*, 584 F.3d 1111, 1114-15 (8th Cir. 2009) (affirming dismissal of securities  
5 fraud claims where plaintiffs did "not specify how two statements by [the outside  
6 auditor], as compared to the complaint's long list of alleged misrepresentations and  
7 omissions by the [defendant] executives, proximately caused the investors' losses").

8 Plaintiffs do not dispute that the vast majority of the information  
9 disclosed to the market had nothing to do with KPMG's 2005 audit report or New  
10 Century's 2005 financials. Those disclosures – upon which market analysts focused  
11 their attention – revealed the dire effects that the subprime meltdown of 2006 and  
12 2007 was having on the Company's business, accounting errors that had been made  
13 by Company personnel in its unaudited 2006 interim financial statements, the  
14 Company's loss of access in 2007 to the credit lines necessary to continue its business,  
15 numerous governmental investigations in 2007, and ultimately the demise of the  
16 Company. Moreover, the significant elapsed time between the allegedly misleading  
17 2005 audit report and the 2007 investment losses suffered by plaintiffs – combined  
18 with the intervening and dramatic downturn in the residential mortgage markets –  
19 further militate against a finding that KPMG caused any of plaintiffs' losses. Under  
20 these circumstances, summary judgment is appropriate. *See id; Omnicom*, 541 F.  
21 Supp. 2d at 554 (noting that "the law requires the disaggregation of confounding  
22 factors," and granting summary judgment where there was "simply no way for a juror  
23 to determine whether the alleged fraud caused any portion of Plaintiffs' loss").

24

25

26

27

28

Accordingly, the Court **HEREBY ADOPTS** KPMG's [Proposed] Statement of Uncontroverted Facts and Conclusions of Law and **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that defendant KPMG LLP's Motion for Summary Judgment is **GRANTED**.

## **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated:

## Honorable Dean D. Pregerson